

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 were rejected. By way of this amendment, new claims 18-20 have been added. Thus, claims 1-20 are now pending.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,400,246 (Wilson). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites "[a] method of generating a HART alert message within a process control system, comprising the steps of uniquely associating a plurality of device conditions for a HART device with a plurality of device status conditions, each of which is indicative of a different level of severity; detecting a condition associated with the HART device; mapping the condition associated with the HART device to one of the plurality of device status conditions; and generating the HART alert message to include information associated with the condition associated with the HART device and the one of the plurality of device status conditions."

HART (Highway Addressable Remote Transducer) is an open communication protocol via which smart field devices may communicate within a process control network. The HART protocol specifies a plurality of standard status conditions, and HART devices are configured to report their status using these standard status conditions. *See Application* at p. 7, lines 4-8.

Generally, Wilson describes a control system used for a fire and security alarm system of a building. The control system receives various inputs from sensors and smoke detectors. Based on these inputs, the control system may generate one or more digital output signals for controlling security and fire alarms

Wilson does not teach anything about HART devices, device conditions for HART devices, or HART alert messages. Therefore, Wilson does not teach, disclose, or suggest any of the elements of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Wilson.

Claim 2

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that claim 2 is allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 1.

Additionally, claim 2 recites "uniquely associating the plurality of device conditions for the HART device with one of a status condition associated with a failure of the HART device, a status condition associated with maintenance of the HART device and a status condition associated with an advisable action in connection with the HART device."

Wilson does not teach anything about device conditions associated with a failure of a device, maintenance of a device, or an advisable action in connection with a device. Therefore, Wilson does not teach, disclose, or suggest the above-identified elements of claim 2. At least for this additional reason, claim 2 is allowable over Wilson.

Claim 14

Claim 14 recites, inter alia, "associating the detected condition with one of a device failure, device maintenance and advisable action status conditions, each of which is indicative of a different level of severity; and reporting the detected condition via the user interface display using the one of the device failure, device maintenance and advisable action status conditions."

Wilson does not teach anything about a device failure status condition, a device maintenance status condition, or an advisable action status condition. Therefore, Wilson does not teach, disclose, or suggest the above-identified elements of claim 14. At least for this reason, claim 14 is allowable over Wilson.

Other Claims

It is respectfully asserted that independent claim 8 and new independent claim 18 are allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3 and 4 are allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 2.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4. It is respectfully asserted that claim 5 is allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 4.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 6 and 7 are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 9-11 depend from claim 8. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 9-11 are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 8. Additionally, it is respectfully asserted that claims 9-11 are allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 2.

Claim 12 depends from claim 11. It is respectfully asserted that claim 12 is allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 11.

Claim 13 depends from claim 8. Applicants respectfully assert that claim 13 is allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 8.

Claims 15-17 depend from claim 14. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 15-17 are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 14.

Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 19 and 20 are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 18.

Conclusion

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: June 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory E. Stanton

Registration No.: 45,127

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicants